CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505



1. ES. DIR
2. ER

May 13, 1982

Mr. Normal Balabanian
Editor, Technology and Society Magazine
111 Link Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

Dear Mr. Balabanian:

Thank you for your memorandum of April 27, 1982, which changed the delivery data on Admiral Inman's "rebuttal" to Dr. Denning to the 15th of May.

Admiral Inman's second set of personal views, for publication in your magazine in September, is attached.

I believe this completes the exchange and I look forward to seeing the full set of remarks in print.

If there is anything further I may do to assist you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

STAT

[redacted]

Special Assistant to the Deputy
Director of Central Intelligence

Attachment

L-304

# A Response to Dr. Peter J. Denning's Article:

# "A Scientist's View of Government Control Over Scientific Publication"

by

Admiral B. R. Inman
Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

Technology and Society Magazine
September 1982

Approved For Release 2007/05/21 : CIA-RDP83M00914R002300060023-0

These personal views respond to Dr. Denning's article. They are not a rebuttal because I agree with much of Dr. Denning's statement. It is, in fact, hard to disagree with much of his text. Some of his text is historical, and some is descriptive of recent events or the views of others.

One of Dr. Denning's themes is that significant steps are being proposed by various officials and elements of government to change the existing relationships between science and national security. I agree with that observation. Dr. Denning says in effect that blanket restrictions on science, broadly speaking, would not work and would be counter-productive. In general, I agree.

But Dr. Denning writes at the end of his article: "If you want to win the Indianapolis 500 Mile Race each year, you build the fastest car. You don't throw nails on the track." That analogy only seems to highlight my basic concerns. For example, competing race teams do try to go faster each year; in fact, in each race. And when they succeed, they guard carefully their edge and the means by which they acquired it. It is true that the other teams are looking for their competition's secrets, as well as the winner's, and they may find them eventually. But race teams, even in the camaraderie of their sport, rarely if ever give away their advantages free. Yet the scientific and technical advantages attained in this nation <u>are</u> being acquired by this nation's adversaries.

In a way, scientists and engineers in our society are members of a special endeavor--a race team, so to speak. But they are not the majority and they alone don't control the rules which govern the team. Some changes are being considered because we--as a society--have been giving our advantages away and allowing them to be stolen, often with grave national security implications. Such activities in the scientific and technical community are only a small part of the larger issue, however, and only a fraction of the technical information published in this nation is--in fact--advantageous to our adversaries and competitors. And when we lose our advantages in such areas, we lose a lot more than simply a race around an oval track.

Dr. Denning writes that the scientific community should welcome legislative hearings because they would give a full public airing of all sides. I could not agree more. I have spoken out publicly to urge both sides to think about the basic problem and to talk to each other about how scientists and engineers can create a workable and fair solution on their own.

Dr. Denning's article, as part of that dialogue, is a step forward. Other steps at dialogue are underway as well, and I am confident that wise voices in that exchange will find solutions that are productive to everyone.